DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 478 SP 038 051

AUTHOR Dolly, John P.
TITLE The Induction and Socialization of New Faculty: The Role of the Professional Development School.
PUB DATE 1998-06-00
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium (JUSTEC) Conference (Kyoto, Japan, June 24-28, 1998).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; College Faculty; Collegiality; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Mentors; Peer Relationship; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Socialization

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the literature dealing with the professional development school as the ideal setting for educator preparation programs. Researchers claim that professional development schools can be sites where graduate students preparing for academic careers can be socialized to the roles and responsibilities of teacher educators, and they can be sites for newly hired faculty to further develop their skills working with collaborative groups on real school-based issues. Induction programs alone will not produce the desired results unless new Ph.D.'s are socialized appropriately within the graduate program. New faculty in colleges of education must be able to work in collaborative teams both inside and outside the institution. Collaboration must become part of the reward structure and be reinforced by department chairs. Lack of collegiality is a common faculty concern, yet collegiality is essential to any successful development program for new professors. Peer relationships are as important in socialization as successful relationships with faculty mentors. Barriers to success include organizational, professional/interpersonal, professional (individual), and personal challenges. Programs for new faculty that promote mentoring and provide smooth transitions to the new institution are vital to faculty retention, productivity, and success. Traditional mentoring is insufficient. Induction must involve the institution taking the new faculty member and infusing a clear set of expectations and values consistent with the college of education as an institution dedicated to improving classroom instruction and the operation of schools and schooling. (Contains 18 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 478

The Induction and Socialization of New Faculty: The Role of The Professional Development School

John P. Dolly

The University of Alabama

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

J. Dolly

A paper presented at the meeting of the Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium, Bukkyo University, Kyoto, Japan, June 1998.

SP038051

The professional development school can serve two critical functions in educator preparation programs. It can serve as a site where graduate students preparing for academic careers can be socialized to the roles and responsibilities of being a teacher educator. It can also be used with newly hired faculty as a site to further develop their skills working with collaborative groups on real school based issues. Unlike traditional faculty who are often prepared to work as independent researchers and teachers, the faculty member of the future will need to be able to function at times as an independent teacher and researcher, but be equally adept at working collaboratively in both a teaching and research mode. The professional development school is the ideal setting for developing these skills.

In reviewing the research across many disciplines, there is a sense that an induction program by itself will not produce the results desired unless the new Ph.D. was socialized appropriately within his or her graduate program. The important place to begin is in the doctoral program that prepares the next generation of professors. Unless we can modify those experiences and provide the necessary socialization process to support characteristics that we identify as appropriate for a new professor, an institution on its own will have minimal impact on the induction and socialization process.

According to Hekelman, Zyzanski and Flocke (1995) the research productivity of new faculty is greatly influenced by the environment in which they find themselves and the amount of research time offered. There appears to be a direct relationship between productivity and research time; not a surprising finding. Their research pointed out that there are major differences in the initial preparation of tenure track faculty preparing them to conduct independent research. One of the most important factors they identified with research productivity were the research activities and the environment of the faculty in which they found themselves. They also found that the role of department chair was critical in supporting and mentoring faculty. Vaitukaitis (1991) also identified factors associated with research activity. According to Vaitukaitis, the development of scholarly habits occurs through graduate and fellowship programs that train an appropriate socialized faculty to do research. This is one of several studies that indicate the socialization process in one's graduate program is one of the predictive factors in determining whether or not someone will be a good colleague and/or good researcher. Unfortunately, according to Fink (1992), graduate schools have not accepted any significant level of responsibility for the adequate preparation of graduate students who intend to enter academic professions.

There is also literature dealing with faculty renewal and faculty retention which is related to induction and socialization, but is different. Of interest in this literature is the clear understanding that the diversity of faculty in terms of their interests, strengths, and backgrounds, requires any program to support their development to be multi-faceted and multi-dimensional in order to be successful. There appears to be some general consensus in this literature that the notion of one model fits all will lead to failure.

In an article by Chronister (1991), he indicates that one of the difficulties for junior faculty is their own self interest which becomes the driving force in their performance within universities. At our research universities where the reward system is based on scholarship, and in some cases excellence in teaching, these two areas drive the behavior of the junior faculty member and he describes them as being "privatized" because of the overwhelming pressure on them to produce and publish in their disciplines, thereby isolating them in the larger academic community. Many of us recognize this as a reality within our own institutions and this is something that we want to counteract with any induction program developed since we are assuming that new faculty in a college of education must be able to work in collaborative teams both inside and outside the institution. Somehow collaboration needs to become part of the reward structure, and as the literature would suggest, must be reinforced by the department chair. What is clear in Chronister's brief article are the conflicting values we lay on new faculty. The recognition for working on journals as editors, and within their disciplines which is often rewarded with promotion, tenure, and merit raises, vs. time spent in a clinical setting helping practitioners improve their craft.

Rosch and Reich (1996) identify four stages related to a conceptual model concerning faculty development. The first stage deals with what they call the pre-arrival stage and this consists of an individual's predispositions prior to entering a new setting. The second stage is the encounter stage which deals with an individual's preconceptions formed during recruitment and selection for a position. The third stage is called the adaptation stage dealing with external socialization processes and identification with the organization. The fourth stage is the commitment stage which deals with the extent to which the norms and values of the local culture are assimilated by new members of the organization. In the article they refer to prior literature by Cornwall and Grimes (1987) and Satow (1975) that again reinforces the notion that professional identity and role orientation are acquired during graduate training. The point made in the article is the fact that the professional identity acquired through extensive and intensive formal education tends to be stable over time. The suggestion from this literature indicates that while professionals may be socialized to new roles in new settings, they bring with them a reality in which they expect to function, and this reality has been shaped during their graduate education. Again, this gets back to the concern for having an intensive experience for doctoral students that introduces them to the new realities of working with K-12 educators as well as colleagues in higher education. The authors indicate that role orientation can shift as faculty become assimilated into a new setting, but clearly the values acquired and expectations brought with them from their graduate programs have a great deal of influence over the way they approach a new position and are assimilated into a new institution. The authors also point out that for many new faculty, they are not provided specific criteria or direction and, in fact, are allowed a great deal of autonomy in adapting to a new higher education environment. Given limited direction within a new setting, it is not surprising that new faculty would draw from their student experiences as they become more immersed in the realities of teaching, and in most cases, simply imitated or modeled the teaching styles and experiences they had from their own graduate school mentors. In summary, the authors conclude that there is a cumulative learning period during which individuals build upon and draw from their graduate training experiences in assuming the role of assistant professor. In the new setting, it becomes critical that departments frequently and clearly disseminate information about performance standards and expectations in unambiguous ways to new faculty. In most cases, where there are vague performance standards, new faculty fall back on data and experiences from when they themselves were graduate students.

Rosch and Reich (1996) also dealt with people at different stages, both pre- and post-hiring in higher education. The study clearly suggests unless you have appropriate experiences while a graduate student, you come to an institution at a significant disadvantage. The authors claim that new faculty learned or misinterpreted performance expectations through informal communication encounters, indicating that departments have a need to frequently and clearly disseminate information about performance standards. This is similar to other research that seems to indicate a great deal of ambiguity and uncertainty among new faculty about performance standards and the lack of specificity most receive from department chairs and/or institutions. In this study, the authors found that new faculty are usually reluctant to make their needs known, feeling that any indication of either a lack of information or lack of knowledge about policies and procedures would lead to a negative judgement of their abilities as a faculty member.

According to Finkelstein and Peterson (1992), there are data to show that new and junior faculty work extremely hard, find themselves under intense time constraints due to the necessity of spending more time on teaching, and involvement in research that leads to publication. The authors conclude that it's not surprising that junior faculty are less satisfied than senior faculty because of these pressures. The concerns that emerge from the literature, according to these authors, for junior faculty are what they quote as the lack of collegiality (stimulating support of and sustaining interaction with colleagues on professional issues), and a sense of isolation which, according to the authors, emerges over and over again as a major concern of new faculty. The great advantage of the professional development school is to serve as a site in which to conduct research with colleagues who have similar interests often in collaborative teams.

The lack of collegiality is cited in virtually every study of faculty concerns. Sorcinelli (1992), Turner and Boice (1989), also found that new faculty tend to report a lack of collegial relations as both a surprise and a very disappointing aspect of their initial appointment at a new institution; collaboration and support for teaching and research were almost non-existent. In these articles they found that new faculty identified very closely with chairpersons who were supportive and who served as advocates and these people who have served in this role become the critical individuals for new faculty during their first year at an institution.

Boice (1992) indicated that very often minority faculty and other faculty who feel stressed within a new environment tend to find themselves socially isolated with a high degree of confusion about what is expected of them. Often these faculty learn about the norms and expectations only in retention or tenure review reports long after corrections could help them succeed in the university. According to Jarvis (1992), the most important single factor in faculty development is the concept of collegiality. There are data to suggest that non-publishing professors found themselves suffering from social isolation and there was a high correlation between social isolation and non-involvement in publication. He further indicated that there is unanimous agreement that collegiality is central to any successful development program for new professors.

Kirk and Todd-Mancillas (1991) summarize a number of studies concerning the issue of graduate student socialization. Based on their research, the authors conclude that in socializing graduate students, it is critical that there be created supportive interpersonal relationships with both peers and faculty. The research seems to indicate that graduate students can learn much from each other as well as from faculty mentors, but this only works if the students are available and interacting across these groups while serving as graduate students. Their study also indicated graduate students reported that working with full-time faculty members and other graduate students in establishing common course work, goals and assignments help strengthen the student's feelings of acceptance and belonging within the institution and the profession. They also found that "one of the most important turning-point types identified as strengthening occupational identify was receiving information from the department on how to successfully fulfill the department's required procedures (how and when to complete forms, construct exams, and submit grades, etc.). Because this information reduces uncertainty and strengthens identification, departments should frequently and clearly disseminate information about performance policies and standards" (p. 417).

An implication of the Kirk and Todd Mancillas (1991) study is the need for future faculty members to be full time graduate students. You can't develop the skills or relationships necessary to succeed as a faculty member unless you are emersed in the role. Being a part-time student fails to provide the experiences necessary for a future faculty role. The need to be a full-time graduate student is also supported by Weidman and Stein (1990). They pointed out that the professional socialization process has both cognitive and affective dimensions. They argue that one of the central purposes of a post-baccalaureate program in education is to prepare novices for professional practice by socializing them into the cognitive and affective dimensions of their anticipated professional roles. In order to do this, you would need to have access to the students and not simply have them drop in on a part-time basis to take unconnected course work. They quote research studies concerning the importance of role modeling as one example of an interpersonal process within the framework they lay out. Again, role modeling will not work unless someone is around to observe the role models and interact with them on a regular basis. If you are not around an academic institution and professional academicians in your chosen field, then the conclusion seems to be that you will not be socialized to your profession, instead you will be socialized to your work place.

Purna and Hudgins (1996) looked at the socialization experiences of doctoral students enrolled in a school of education in a public research university that emphasized graduate assistantships as a mechanism for doctoral students professional socialization. The study identified certain benefits received by doctoral students with research assistantships such as provision of structurally based opportunities for students to

interact with and learn from faculty. It also created a ready-made peer group and created an informal socialization experience across graduate assistants. The paper is of significant value because of its excellent summary of prior research on the socialization aspects of graduate education and graduate assistantships on future faculty.

In an article by Sands, Parson and Duane (1991), they trace in a historical perspective, the concept of mentoring and mentoring relationships. The study is important in that it identifies the definitions of mentor that have been used over time and the fact that the lack of an operational definition makes the literature difficult to organize in supporting mentoring and/or induction programs. They themselves say the result of the diverse treatment of the concept leads to the results where one study cannot be compared to the results of other studies. According to Sands et. al., ecological theory leads to the notion that human relationships are developed in the context of person environment exchanges. Individuals will adapt to their environments over time and the ability to thrive in a new environment is related to the goodness of fit between the person and the environment, the satisfaction of mutual needs. This would suggest that if we plan to place faculty in situations of high stress in professional development schools with clear expectations to be collaborative in working with our K-12 colleagues, then we would want to see experiences similar to those expectations in the new faculty member's past, whether it occurred as a result of prior K-12 teaching experience or was the result of the person's graduate program. Sands et. al. also indicate that what is seen as a decline in mentoring from graduate school to employment in academic settings may simply reflect what we have as expectations within universities, that those who have a Ph.D. are capable of autonomous practice as a university professor and this individual does not need the same type of support or mentoring that was present in graduate school. This article also pointed out that because mentor is defined in many different ways, that mentoring itself is a complex multi-dimensional phenomena, and different types of mentors are needed to match with the personality and experiences of a new faculty member. The implication being that a mismatch between the expectations of a new faculty member and a person assigned as a mentor could lead to discouragement and a lack of success on the part of the faculty being mentored.

Johnsrude and Heck (1992) in their study, attempted to identify factors that faculty perceive as barriers to academic success. Their study came up with four categories of factors, the first being organizational barriers, including structural discrimination, a work load balance, institutional support, and tenure pressure. The second factor was called professional/interpersonal barriers, this included relationships with the department chair and department, perceived personal discrimination, and demands of students. The third factor identified was professional (individual) barriers. This included time pressures and role preparation. The fourth category was called personal barriers and these factors were time for personal life, quality of life, and emotional security. Of interest is the fact that many of these factors appeared to parallel those identified in prior research showing a certain consistency across time about factors that need to be attended to in order to provide both satisfaction to a new faculty member and to ensure his/her retention at an institution. Like other studies that have talked about the relationship with the department and the chair, factors that emerged in this study also appear consistent with prior research talking about social and intellectual fit with the department, clear tenure criteria from the chair, feedback about one's performance, and the need for adequate mentoring from department personnel.

According to Miller and Nadler (1994) programs for new faculty members that promote mentoring and provide a smooth transition to the new institution have been described as vital to faculty retention, productivity, and success. In their article, they refer to research that indicates the nurturing must be built into graduate student training, that this is the area where we can have the greatest impact on future faculty. There is also the concern that when we do develop programs for faculty, whether they are mentoring or induction programs, that we really don't know how to prepare the current generation of faculty members because we are not clear what we are preparing them for. This is something that becomes repetitive in the literature, the need for clear objectives and clear expectations for new faculty if they hope to be successful at a new university.

According to Miller and Nadler, the key questions faculty want to know are "what role do I have at this institution?" followed by "how do I fulfill this role?" and eventually, "what role do I have in this department?"

In developing programs for induction and socialization of new faculty, it is important that we more clearly define our goals and objectives and distinguish induction from the historical descriptor, mentoring. By induction we mean a much more elaborate process whereby the institution takes a new faculty member and infuses in that individual a clear set of expectations and values consistent with the emerging college of education as an institution dedicated to improving classroom instruction and the operation of schools and schooling. This is significantly different from traditional mentoring programs that were designed to support individual faculty in the pursuit of an individual agenda disconnected from the goals of the college or the university other than the goals of publish and improvement of instruction. In the new college of education, not only will people have to be able to function as an individual, but if they are unable to function in a collaborative relationship in a collaborative environment, they will be unable to bring their knowledge and expertise to bear in professional development schools working with colleagues, both K-12 and higher education. If new faculty are unable to take on this role, then the question is do they really belong in a research college of education that is committed to working in a collaborative model?

As the Miller and Nadler article (1994) suggests, it becomes critical to define a role we want faculty to play in a college of education. Do we want all faculty to have a given set of characteristics? Do we want to argue that each faculty member should be playing a different role with certain common elements to be shared by all faculty? Clearly, some faculty must be able to work directly in public schools. Should we make this a requirement of all faculty? For example, do we now require our faculty in educational research/educational psychology and other disciplines that have historically been disconnected from K-12 education to now become emersed in the work of schools so that their research, their practice and their teaching has a relevance that many of these faculty currently do not display either in their teaching or research?

We also need to define in the development of a program to prepare the new professoriate, how we differentiate between those students coming to us with prior K-12 experience, particularly recent K-12 experience, vs. those coming to us with no K-12 experience or K-12 experience that is basically outdated. Given the literature that supports the need for appropriate socialization opportunities for graduate students combined with a need to provide a collegial environment for new faculty, the professional development school is an ideal setting to serve as the critical catalyst in the future development of education faculty.

References

Boice, R. (1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 51-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chronister, J. L. (1991, September-October). Institutional culture and the new professoriate. Academe, pp. 23-25.

Cornwall, J. P., & Grimes, A. J. (1987). Cosmopolitan-local: A class-lagged correlation analysis of the relationship between professional role orientation and behaviors in academic organizations. Journal of Human Relations, 40(May), 281-297.

Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty, (pp. 39-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finkelstein, M. J., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. W. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty, (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hekelman, F. P., Zyzanski, S. J. & Flocke, S. A. (1995). Successful and less-successful research performance of junior faculty. Research in Higher Education, 36(2), 235-255.

Jarvis, D. K. (1992). Improving junior faculty scholarship. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 63-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnsrud, L. K. & Heck, R. H. (1992, October). A university faculty: Those who stay and those who leave. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis.

Kirk, D., & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1991). Turning points in graduate student socialization: Implications for recruiting future faculty. The Review of Higher Education, 14(3), 407-422.

Miller, M. T., & Nadler, D. P. (1994). Orientation program considerations for new community college faculty. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 18, 441-448.

Perna, L. W., & Hudgins, C. (1996, November). The graduate assistantship: Facilitator of graduate students' professional socialization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 402 822)

Rosch, T. A., & Reich, J. N. (1996). The enculturation of new faculty in higher education. Research in Higher Education, 37(1), 115-131.

Sands, R. G., Parson, L. A. & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. Journal of Higher Education, 62(2), 175-192.

Satow, R. L. (1975). Value-rational authority and professional organizations: Weber's missing type. Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 526-531.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1989). Experiences of new faculty. Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development, 7(2), 51-57.

Vaitukaitis, J. L. (1991). The future of clinical research. Clinical Researcher, 39(2), 142-156).

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (1990, October). The professional socialization of graduate students in educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.